

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,186	12/19/2001	Matthew R. Wilson	KCX-489(17400)	6465

7590 02/11/2003

Stephen E. Bondura  
Dority & Manning, Attorneys at Law, P.A.  
P.O. Box 1449  
Greenville, SC 29602

EXAMINER

KIM, SANG K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3654

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,186

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examiner

SANG KIM

Art Unit

3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-23 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 3, "a circumferential portion" should be "a circumferential surface portion".

Claim 1, line 8, "a circumference" should be "a circumference surface of said chopper roll".

Appropriate correction is required. Applicant is advised to look through the rest of the claims 14-23 for similar mistakes. For example, claim 18, line 9, "a circumference" should be "a circumference surface of said chopper roll".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, lines 11-14, "tangentially and radially" is indefinite because it is unclear how the element can be both tangential and radial.

Claim 2, lines 2-3, "a non-parallel plane with respect to a plane" is indefinite because the direction in which a non-parallel plane is not defined between a horizontal or a vertical.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "said second segment" in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Examiner cannot determine what is applicant referring to when "an angle greater than normal", in claim 18, lines 12-15, is one of many examples of indefiniteness found in the claim. Applicant is advised to look through the rest of the claims 14-23 for similar mistakes.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leanna et al, U.S. Patent No. 4280669.

Referring to claims 1, 13, and 14, Leanna et al teach a bedroll 18 disposed such that web material 7 from a parent roll passes around a circumferential surface portion of said bedroll; a pair of bedroll blades 32, 34 retractably mounted on said bedroll 18 and able to move from retracted position to a protracted position radially beyond said bedroll surface to engage the web material for a web cutting event as shown in Figs 4 and 7; a chopper roll 20 disposed next to said bedroll, said chopper roll comprising a first blade 33 and a second blade 36 extending from a circumference surface of said chopper roll; said first and second blades rotationally intermeshing with said bedroll blades in said

Art Unit: 3654

web cutting event as shown in Fig. 7; said first blade and second blades extending from said chopper roll as shown in Figs. 4-10.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leanna et al, U.S. Patent No. 4280669.

Referring to claims 5 and 17, Leanna et al does not disclose the distance or spacing between the blade tips between the bedroll blades and the chopper roll blades in the specification. It would have been obvious to space the first and second blades farther apart than the bedroll blades, since the distance between the blades lacks any disclosed criticality and is thus obvious as a choice of design.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 18 and 23 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 2-4, 6-12, 15-16, and 19-22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references of record show other exemplary web cut-off in a rewinder.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-3712. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703) 308-2688. The fax phone numbers are (703) 308-0552 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

SK

1/24/03



**KATHY MATECKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**